

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-32 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 12, 17 and 24 are independent claims. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9 and 12-20 have been amended, and claims 21-32 have been added.

These modifications are fully supported by the original disclosure and do not add any new matter.

Examiner Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the telephone interviews which were conducted on April 16, 2008. Applicants' representative explained the features of the invention that distinguish the present invention from the prior art. The claims have been amended in the manner discussed during the interview. The Examiner suggested amending the independent claims to clarify the features of the control points so as to distinguish over the features of Cho et al., particularly a UPnP application program interface. Therefore, the independent claims have been amended to clarify the features of the control points. Applicants' representative further argued that the control points and the UPnP devices in the present application are within the same UPnP network system whereas Cho et al. teaches controlling the UPnP device from an external network. The Examiner suggested amending or adding dependent claims to describe these features of the present invention and present an argument. Therefore, claims 21-23 have been added to recite these features.

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested

Claim Amendments

Applicants have amended the claims in order to place the claims in better form. The claim amendments are not being made in response to any statutory requirement for patentability, and have not been narrowed in scope. Instead, the claims have been amended merely to recite the subject matter therein more clearly.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cho et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0217136) in view of Humpleman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,971). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

As suggested by the Examiner in the Examiner's interview, independent claims have been amended to clarify the features of a control point. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to further recite, among other features, that each of the at least two CPs is capable of independently and directly managing and/or adjusting the UPnP device. Amended independent claims 12 and 17 include similar features in a varying scope.

These features are supported at least by a non-limiting example shown in FIGs. 1 and 6 of the present application. For example, a control point (CP) directly manages and/or adjusts an operation of UPnP devices according to a user's command, and the current invention has two control points 610 and 710, as shown in FIGs. 1 and 6 of the present application (see also page 5, lines 13-16 of the specification). Further, each of the two control points 610 and 710 is capable of independently managing and/or adjusting the UPnP device. Therefore, each of the at least two

CPs in the present application is configured to independently and directly manage and/or adjust the UPnP device.

On the contrary, a user inputs a control command through the UPnP application program interface (API) in Cho et al. so that the control point can actually control the specific devices in response to the control (see paragraph [0005] of Cho et al.). Therefore, API in Cho et al. cannot directly or independently manage and/or adjust the UPnP devices, but rather has to go through the control point to manage and/or adjust the UPnP devices. Cho et al. also teaches that the Internet client 100, 110 sends command to a UPnP proxy server 130, and then the UPnP proxy server sends control messages to the UPnP devices 150 (see paragraph [0026] of Cho et al.). However, the Internet client 100, 110 in Cho et al. cannot directly or independently manage and/or adjust the UPnP devices because Internet client 100, 110 has to go through the UPnP proxy server 130 to control the UPnP devices. Further, Humpleman et al. fails to teach or suggest these deficiencies of Cho et al.

Accordingly, amended independent claims 1, 12 and 17 are allowable and each claim depending therefrom is also allowable.

Claims Added

Claims 21-32 have been added for the Examiner's consideration. Applicants submit that claims 21-23 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 15 and 17, respectively and are therefore allowable based on their dependence from claims 1, 12 and 17, which are believed to be allowable.

In addition, claims 21-23 recite further limitations which are not disclosed or made obvious by the applied prior art references. In particular, Cho et al. teaches the Internet client 100, 110

controlling the UPnP devices 150 by sending command from the external Internet network using Internet client 100, 110 to the UPnP proxy server 130. Therefore, Cho et al. teaches that a UPnP proxy server 130 and the UPnP devices 150 are within the same UPnP network and the Internet client 100, 110 is outside the UPnP network. Accordingly, Cho et al. does not teach or suggest that the at least two CPs are within the same UPnP-based home network system as the UPnP device.

Claims 24-32 are system claims reciting similar features of method claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 21. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted new claims 24-32 are allowable.

Consideration and allowance of claims 21-32 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and to provide an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment After Final, in that it raises no new issues but merely places the claims in a form more clearly patentable over the references of record. In the alternative, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment After Final in that it reduces the issues for appeal.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jun S. Ha (Registration No. 58,508) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 9, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Esther Chong ³⁴
Esther H. Chong
Registration No.: 40,953
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicants